



PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING AGENDA

Via Zoom

<https://zoom.us/j/95573143683>

or by phone: (253) 215-8782 Meeting ID: 955 7314 3683

Wednesday, January 27, 2021, at 7:00 p.m.

- 1. Call to Order – Flag Salute**
- 2. Roll Call**
- 3. Approval of the Agenda**
- 4. City Staff Announcements**
- 5. Approval of Minutes**
 - a) Minutes from the January 13, 2021 Planning Commission Meeting
- 6. Citizens' Comments**
- 7. Workshop**
 - a) Housing & Job Targets Update – *L. Thomas*
 - b) General Update (temporary uses, signs; building/energy code, survey) – *L. Thomas*
 - c) Development Map Update – *T. Davis*
- 8. Public Hearing(s) - none**
- 9. Unfinished Business – none**
- 10. New Business – none**
- 11. Good of the Order**
- 12. Adjournment**

Next Meeting: February 10, 2021

Attachments

- Minutes from the January 13, 2021 Planning Commission Meeting
- Growth Targets Packet
- Current Development Summary Table

(Please email Troy Davis at troy.davis@duvallwa.gov if you have any questions or if you cannot attend the meeting.)

Meeting Room is Wheelchair Accessible. Americans With Disabilities Act - Reasonable Accommodations Provided Upon Request - (425) 788-2779

Creating 2044 Growth Targets for King County

As a part of the 2021 Countywide Planning Policies update, King County is leading the process to set new growth targets for jurisdictions to use in the 2024 periodic update of comprehensive plans. Creating growth targets is a collaborative effort in King County, facilitated by King County staff with the participation of planning staff from each jurisdiction. The process uses the [VISION 2050 Regional Growth Strategy](#) as a platform for distributing growth to King County and Regional Geographies within King County, and a deliberative process to refine a set of preliminary housing and job growth targets for each jurisdiction. Ultimately, growth targets will be finalized and adopted by the [Growth Management Planning Council](#) in the adopted 2021 Countywide Planning Policies.

This document describes the technical methodology for creating preliminary target ranges for each jurisdiction and summarizes the process each Regional Geography group has taken to establish a baseline from which to select draft growth targets.

Interpreting Growth Targets

Growth Targets are policy statements about the amount of housing and job growth each jurisdiction is planning for. Under the Growth Management Act, all jurisdictions share a role in accommodating future growth, though the amount will differ by the role each jurisdiction plays in the county and region. Targets form the basis for the land use assumptions in comprehensive plans. Drawing from PSRC's guidance on growth targets in VISION 2050, the land use assumptions used in comprehensive plans must be substantially consistent with adopted growth targets.¹ As such, growth targets are the numbers jurisdictions should be aiming for in their plans, and all King County jurisdictions would be well served to fully participate in setting growth targets, to ensure they reflect anticipated future growth.

How the Urban Growth Capacity Report (Buildable Lands) Relates to Growth Targets

The Urban Growth Capacity Report and growth target setting are separate but intersecting components of growth management in King County. The Urban Growth Capacity Report is a mid-cycle performance check on growth and planning goals of adopted comprehensive plans, including adopted growth targets. For the 2021 Urban Growth Capacity Report, this will mean reporting on adopted 2006-35 growth targets and 2015 comprehensive plans.

The growth target setting process will support the 2024 periodic update of comprehensive plans, with targets covering roughly 2019-2044. The calculated capacity from the Urban Growth Capacity Report is a key reference for the growth target setting process, as jurisdictions want to understand and compare their relative amounts of capacity, but jurisdictions may consider a number of additional factors in setting their growth target.

Because capacity calculated in the Urban Growth Capacity Report is constrained by the assumptions of currently adopted plans and recently developed housing and workplaces, it may not reflect the entirety of the planned future for a jurisdiction. For example, a newly permitted major development, planned visioning around a neighborhood center, or a necessary zoning change around a future infrastructure investment may not be accounted for in the capacity calculation from the Urban Growth Capacity

¹ Puget Sound Regional Council, *VISION 2050*, <https://www.psrc.org/sites/default/files/vision-2050-plan.pdf>, p.46.

King County Growth Targets Growth Targets Methodology and Process Summary

Report. King County's growth target setting process makes space for a variety of additional related factors to be considered alongside of the initial and final capacity as calculated through the Urban Growth Capacity process. Comprehensive plans should have land capacity analyses to support their growth assumptions. These may be based on the Urban Growth Capacity Report and incorporate new analysis for places where future development is likely to differ.

Creating Preliminary Target Ranges

Step 1: Create Countywide and Regional Geography Allocations

Drawing from the VISION 2050 Regional Growth Strategy PSRC's Regional Macroeconomic Forecast, King County's share of regional growth (50% population, 59% employment) is applied to the forecasted regional growth for 2019-2044, to create the **countywide growth allocation**. Then the Regional Geography shares of growth are applied to the countywide growth allocation, to create the 2019-2044 **Regional Geography allocations**. Population is converted to housing units by Regional Geography, using assumptions tailored to each regional geography. The Regional Geography total housing and job allocations are located at the bottom of the *Inputs* tab in the refined preliminary target range spreadsheets.

Step 2: Select Data Factors

Data factors are relevant data variables used to break out the Regional Geography allocations to preliminary growth targets for each jurisdiction. Data factors were identified from past growth targets setting exercises, and input from planners and staff on the Growth Management Planning Council's Interjurisdictional Team, and the Urban Growth Capacity Technical Committee. The data factors selected include: current 2006-2035 targets, recent jobs and housing growth (2012-2018, and 2006-2019 respectively), current jobs and housing estimates (2019 and 2020, respectively), jurisdiction land area, and initial capacity estimates of housing units and non-residential square feet, from draft Urban Growth Capacity Report data. Though they have not progressed through the Regional Geography level target setting deliberations, two additional series of weighed data factors were created for some jurisdictions. Metro cities, Core cities, and High Capacity Transit Communities have an additional set of data factors weighted by the number of high capacity transit stops within a jurisdiction. Metro cities and Core cities also have an additional set of data factors weighted by the number of designated regional centers in each city.

High capacity transit stops were determined by the Puget Sound Regional Council as an input to VISION 2050, and include existing and planned light rail, commuter rail, ferry, bus rapid transit, and high-frequency, all-day service bus stops.

Step 3: Collect Data Factors

Once defined, data factors are collected from state, regional, and local sources. These sources are listed below.

- **Housing Units 2020:** OFM April 1st estimates for 2020
- **Jobs 2019:** PSRC/ESD Total employment, less construction/resource sector jobs
- **HU Target:** 2006-35 extended targets
- **Jobs Target:** 2006-35 extended targets
- **Land Area:** Area of jurisdiction in acres

King County Growth Targets

Growth Targets Methodology and Process Summary

- **HU 2006-19:** OFM Small Area Estimates
- **Jobs 2012-18:** PSRC/ESD Total Employment, less construction/resource sector
- **HU Capacity:** initial residential capacity from Urban Growth Capacity Phase 3 reporting, expressed in housing units
- **Job Capacity:** initial non-residential capacity from Urban Growth Capacity Phase 3 reporting. Non-residential capacity was converted to jobs via two assumptions: in industrial zones by multiplying area by an assumption of 750 sq ft/job; in other non-residential zones by multiplying area by an assumption of 350 sq ft/job

In the preliminary target ranges spreadsheet, the values for these data factors are found on the *Inputs* tab. Initial capacity data from the Urban Growth Capacity Report will continue to change and be updated as data is finalized in the first quarter of 2021.

Step 4: Convert Raw Data Factors into Shares (%) to Apply to Regional Geography Allocations

After the data factors are collected, they are converted to a **percentage share** that can be applied to the Regional Geography allocations to create preliminary targets for each jurisdiction. Data factors are grouped by Regional Geography, and summed for a total at the Regional Geography level. Then, each jurisdiction's data factor value is divided by the Regional Geography total to create a percentage representing the share each jurisdiction within a Regional Geography. This process is repeated for each data factor. In the original preliminary target ranges spreadsheet, these shares are found on the *Metro %s*, *Core %s*, *HCT %s*, and *Cities_Towns %s* tabs. In the refined preliminary target range spreadsheets, the ranges are found on the *Inputs* tab.

Example:

$$\text{Jurisdiction \% Share Housing Units} = \frac{\text{Jurisdiction 2020 Housing Units}}{\text{Total 2020 Housing Units in Regional Geography}}$$

Formatted: Font: Not Bold

Step 5: Apply Data Factor Shares to Regional Geography Allocations to Create Preliminary Targets

To create a **preliminary target** for each jurisdiction, the data factor shares from the previous step are multiplied by the Regional Geography growth allocation. This apportions the Regional Geography allocation to jurisdictions, proportionate to a jurisdiction's data factor value. This step is repeated for each data factor. Taking the different data factor derived values together creates a range for each jurisdiction. In the original preliminary target ranges spreadsheet, these ranges are found on the *Metro*, *Core*, *HCT*, and *Cities_Towns* tabs. In the refined preliminary target range spreadsheets, the ranges are found on the *Refined Prelim Target Ranges* tab.

$$(\text{Jurisdiction \% Share}) \times (\text{Regional Geography Growth Allocation}) = \text{Preliminary Target}$$

Interpreting the Preliminary Target Ranges

Each column on the *Refined Prelim Target Ranges* tabs (*Metro*, *Core*, *HCT*, and *Cities_Towns* tabs in the original preliminary target ranges) can be interpreted as a scenario that shows how growth targets could look if they were allocated to cities by a single data factor. Each factor has pros and cons that make it relevant or credible (or not) as a foundation for a growth target. The table below lists the benefits and

King County Growth Targets
Growth Targets Methodology and Process Summary

drawbacks of using a specific range value. Once you identify the values that seem most pertinent to your jurisdiction, it might be helpful to examine the high and low values within the range, take average of values, and compare with your city's initial capacity and previous target.

2020 Housing Units or 2019 Jobs	Pro	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Most populous/job-rich cities in Regional Geography receive the most growth Expresses cities' current roles
	Con	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Doesn't account for recent growth trends or future role- maybe not a good fit for jurisdictions anticipating significant change from annexation, new infrastructure investments, or other significant changes
Land Area	Pro	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Similar to existing housing units or jobs, largest cities receive the most growth May be helpful for cities with larger amounts of vacant land or greenfield development
	Con	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not very useful indicator of density or capacity Limited connection to accommodating future growth Does not consider sensitive environmental areas, lack of sewer infrastructure
2035 Housing or Job Target (existing targets)	Pro	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Yields a proportionately similar target to 2015-era growth targets, with an updated forecast and Regional Growth Strategy Helpful indicator if growth in a jurisdiction has been on target
	Con	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> May not account for recent changes in growth Less helpful for cities that have changed Regional Geography designation in VISION 2050
Housing or Job Growth (2006 - 2018)	Pro	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cities that have grown more in the past ~12 years receive larger targets Helpful if recent trends are indicative of future growth
	Con	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does not account for the existing base or size of city Less helpful if factors inducing growth are not expected to continue
Capacity	Pro	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cities with greater relative capacity receive a larger target Targeted growth is based on a city's capacity to absorb growth
	Con	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Less helpful for cities planning to add capacity to accommodate a future target, or if other anticipated changes are not yet reflected in current capacity

Preliminary Target Range Analysis and Baselines

Each Regional Geography group has weighed the relative utility of the various data factors that construct the preliminary target ranges, specific to their Regional Geography category. Some Regional Geographies requested additional information and data to refine or contextualize the preliminary ranges. After assessing the ranges for housing and jobs, each group selected a subset of data factors

King County Growth Targets

Growth Targets Methodology and Process Summary

from the preliminary ranges to establish a baseline to begin deliberation on draft growth targets. This section describes this process and the data factors determined most relevant to setting each group's baseline.

Metro Cities

December Update: The Metro cities discussed the factors most important to their cities in setting growth targets. As job centers conscious of their roles in an affordable housing shortage, the concept of using the job target as a reference in selecting the housing target held meaning. Capacity is also a key factor. Using the range of preliminary job targets and initial capacities expressed in jobs, the cities identified more narrow ranges from within the preliminary ranges. The cities expressed interest in referencing displacement and housing need in the target setting process. The narrowed ranges will be the starting place for further conversation.

Core Cities

December Update: The Core cities have coalesced around a strategy for reviewing the preliminary ranges and developing baselines for housing and jobs. The group elected to remove the land area data factor from consideration for housing and jobs targets, and to review an additional factor: allocating jobs by the 2020 distribution of housing units. There was discussion about removing the outlying high and low values for each city and the 2020 housing data factor from the ranges, but no consensus on either item. To consider the recent job growth factor while accommodating cities that have experienced job losses over the 2006-18 period, the group elected to also examine a more recent period of growth, e.g., 2012-18, where job gains are more likely. The group was supportive of an initial conversion of non-residential capacity to jobs.

To establish a baseline, the group agreed to start from an average of the remaining unweighted data factors. The average will be presented alongside of the initial capacity from the Urban Growth Capacity Report and the existing adopted growth targets for comparison. King County will provide this information to cities, along with additional documentation and a dashboard link at least a week prior to the next Core Cities meeting, to allow cities to digest and form a position on their draft growth target.

High Capacity Transit Communities

December Update: The High Capacity Transit Communities continued to review the data factors for housing and jobs, weighing each factor's relative utility in allocating preliminary targets to each jurisdiction. Because these communities stand to receive important transit investments, members noted the importance of referencing factors that reflect existing and future growth patterns and remaining capacity. The land area data and current targets factors were rated unfavorably among the factors in the preliminary ranges. The group felt it was important to compare preliminary targets to remaining capacity.

The group did not establish a rubric for establishing a baseline, but several jurisdictions appear to be forming positions relative to their capacity and expectations for future growth. King County will provide additional documentation, a reformatted target range spreadsheet, a dashboard link, and survey responses at least a week prior to the next High Capacity Transit Communities meeting.

King County Growth Targets
Growth Targets Methodology and Process Summary

Cities and Towns

December Update: The Cities and Towns Regional Geography group continued to review the data factors primarily for jobs and worked towards establishing a baseline for housing and jobs by identifying the factors the group felt were most relevant to their regional geography. King County staff will repackage the preliminary target ranges with a paired down list of data factors, and additional data (averaging the remaining data factors, revised transportation infrastructure connections) to support the regional geography's move towards establishing a baseline. The group was supportive of an initial conversion of non-residential capacity to jobs, and this information will be presented in the revised data factors.

King County staff will provide this information to cities, along with additional documentation and a dashboard link at least a week prior to the next Cities and Towns meeting.

Urban Unincorporated

December Update: Growth allocated to the Urban Unincorporated area will be distributed to Potential Annexation Areas (PAA) relative to each PAA's amount of developable capacity. This is guided by the Countywide Planning Policies, DP-11.

King County Buildable Lands Report History				
	Planning Period	Growth Target	Net Households	Remaining Target
Buildable Lands Report 2007	2001-2022	1,037	388*	649
Buildable Lands Report 2014	2006-2031	1,140	210*	930
Extended HU Target	2006-2035	1,322	179 (2014-2018)	746
Buildable Lands Report 2021	2019-2044	849 Average 682-1047 Range	240	609 Average 442-807 Range

Net household is a snapshot in time. When the report was issues net households was BP issued.

*KC numbers that may differ from historical City records.

Historical City Records for Building Permits Issued (*Single Family & Multi-Family*)

2001 – 2005 = 328

2006 – 2012 = 294

2014 – 2018 = 179

2019 – Present = 240

PIPELINE* (aka Major Planned Developments)			
Status	Area (acres)	Units	Building Permits Issued
Preliminary Plat Review	9.24	76	0
Engineering Review (Construction Drawing Approval)	22.05	118	0
Engineering Approval	1.02	11	0
Clear & Grade	51.24	273	0
Legal Lots	58.57	269	224
Totals (as of Jan 2021)	142.12	747	224

*Continually updated by City as projects progress or lose vesting

HU Capacity* = initial residential capacity – existing units on re-developable parcels + pipeline

1,516* = 1044 – 175 + 647

*there was a transcription error, should be 1,516 not 1,536.

Pipeline number was provided via email 11/4/2020 and included legal lots and projects in review. *Will be revised again as we refine the numbers.*

No double counting with initial res cap and pipeline (aka Major Planned Developments) units – KC email 1/22/21

King County - UGA is 1 unit per 5 acres for planning purposes (included in our housing target).

Going from Initial Capacity # to Final Capacity # will incur up to +/-20% change based on market factors applied. Currently ROW and public use factors are applied to targets. *Per our discussion with KC staff on 1/19/21.*

2015 COMP PLAN NOTES – CHAPTER 2

2.3.4 GROWTH TARGETS AND DEVELOPMENT CAPACITY

- The current targets for 2035 are: 1,140 additional housing units; and 840 additional jobs - set by King County in coordination with the cities
- Each household in Duvall is projected to include about three people, on average. Based on this, the 2035 population of Duvall (including the UGA) could increase to 10,000 – 12,000 people.

Residential Capacity:

- the City is required to plan for at least the residential growth target.
- capacity relates to the actual physical landscape factoring in the constraints of critical areas, land needs for streets and public facilities, and non-residential uses
- capacity is in part driven by requirements for urban levels of development (for example, a minimum density requirement of four units per acre in urban areas)
- capacity is a result of the citizens' vision for the desired level of development in the City.

Residential Capacity Assumptions:

- The details are set out in Appendix B of 2015 CP.
- Vacant and pipeline residential properties were anticipated to develop at 90% of maximum development potential to account for any yield reductions associated with critical areas.
- Redevelopable residential properties were anticipated to redevelop at 45% of maximum development potential to account for any yield reductions because of site constraints and the associated costs of redevelopment.
- The North UGA was estimated R-4 density consistent with the land use designation.

Light Industrial and Mixed-Use Capacity:

- Include existing commercial floor area data
- Pipeline commercial, light industrial, and mixed-use properties were anticipated to develop at 90% of maximum development potential.
- Vacant commercial, light industrial, and mixed-use properties were anticipated to develop at 75% of maximum development potential to account for any yield reductions associated with development costs or critical areas.
- Redevelopable commercial, light industrial, and mixed-use properties were anticipated to develop at 45% of maximum development potential to account for any yield reductions associated with existing structures, development costs, or critical areas.

Changes between 2004 & 2008 counts:

- 2004 = mobile homes were included as multi-family
- 2008 = mobile homes counted as single family

Table LU-1. 2015 Existing Residential Counts

Date	Multifamily Units	Single –family Units
June 2004	256 ^{1,2}	1,765 ¹
July 2008	186 ³	2,154 ^{2,3}
January 2015	213 ³	2,373 ^{2,3}
January 2021	432 ⁴	2,588 ⁴

¹2004 numbers corrected to remove residences counted in the planning process but not completed at that time.

²Includes Mobile Homes

³Does not include UGAR area (2008 value recalculated to remove UGAR residences)

⁴Added building permit data information to January 2015 numbers

Table LU-2. Housing Units and Population Projections for Urban Growth Areas

Area	Gross Area (acres)	Net Area (acres) ³	2015 Housing Units ^{1,2}	2035 Housing Units	2035 Net Housing Units ³	2035 Population ¹
North UGA	87	34.8	9	139	139	420
Southeast UGA	20	8	1	78	32	236
Southwest UGA	30	NA	1	-1	NA	0
UGAR (North and South)	202	80.8	47	559	323	1688
Total	339	124	58	777	494	2,350

¹Table was created with the assumption that each single-family household contains 3.02 persons residing in one unit. *Source: 2015 Capacity and Transportation Analysis Study/EIS Alternatives. Duvall, WA (2016b).*

²No known changes to 2015 HU in UGAs – 1/2021

³Applied net reduction (60%) to all areas to calculate net HU. Assumes SA, ROW, public use.

Table LU-3. Residential Housing Units 2035 Growth Target and Capacity

2035 Growth Target	2035 Capacity
1,140	1,335

Source: City of Duvall 2015 Capacity and Transportation Analysis Study/EIS Alternatives (2016b)

Table LU-4. Jobs to Household Targets and Jobs/Housing Ratio

	Job Target	Household Target	Jobs/Housing Ratio
Duvall	840	1,140	0.74

Source: 2012 King County Countywide Planning Policies

Table LU-5. Employment Development Capacity

Commercial Type	2015 Square Footage	2021 Vacant Square Footage	2035 Square Footage
Commercial	370,021	896,464	964,790
Light Industrial	56,200	51,400	89,685
Total	426,211	947,864	1,054,475

Source: City of Duvall 2015 Capacity and Transportation Analysis Study/EIS Alternatives (2016b)

2.3.4.1 Employment Capacity

- There is approximately one job for every five residents – significantly lower than the regional average of one job for every two people.
- The King County Countywide Planning Policies include the 2031 employment target for Duvall at an additional 840 jobs.
 - This equates to about 0.75 new jobs per household.
- Duvall's residential growth rate currently surpasses economic growth and will continue to do so until the employment base within the city is expanded.
- Additionally, as housing costs within Duvall continue to outpace higher paying jobs, a greater need for an adequate supply of affordable housing is created.

Table LU-6. Jobs to Household Targets and Jobs/Housing Ratio

	Job Target	Household Target	Jobs/Housing Ratio
Duvall	840	1,140	0.74

Source: 2012 King County Countywide Planning Policies

Table LU-7. Employment Development Capacity

Commercial Type	2015 Square Footage	2021 Square Footage	2035 Square Footage
Commercial	370,021		964,790
Light Industrial	56,200		89,685
Total	426,211		1,054,475

Source: City of Duvall 2015 Capacity and Transportation Analysis Study/EIS Alternatives (2016b)

2015 COMP PLAN – CHAPTER 2

3.3.4.3 Inventory of Existing Housing

Duvall had 2,587 total housing units as of 2015, as indicated in **Table H-5**. The housing stock consists of 92 percent single-family units (includes manufactured housing) and 8 percent multifamily units.

Table H-5. Housing by Type

Type of Housing Unit	2000 ¹	% of total	2010 ²	% of total	2015 ³	% of total	2021 ⁴	% of total
Single-family*	1,415	88.7	2,161	93	2,374	92	2,552	86
Multifamily	181	11.3	154	7	213	8	430	14
Total Units	1,596	-	2,315	-	2,587	-	2,982	-

* Including mobile/manufactured homes

¹ 2000 U.S. Census Bureau

² OFM Forecasting Division, Postcensal Estimates of Housing Units, April 1, 2010 to April 1, 2013.

³ City of Duvall, 2016.

⁴ City of Duvall, Jan 2021.

3.3.5 PROJECTION OF FUTURE HOUSING DEMAND

3.3.5.2 Residential Capacity

- Residential capacity is generally defined as the amount of existing housing units plus new housing a city can accommodate based on city rules (e.g., residential density requirements in the zoning code) and land available for new development.
- Residential capacity relates to residential growth targets in a number of ways.
 - The city is required to plan for at least the residential growth target when determining residential capacity.
 - Capacity relates to the actual physical landscape while a target is a minimum number of housing units allocated to Duvall by King County, irrespective of actual capacity.
 - Capacity is in part driven by requirements for urban levels of development (example, a minimum net density of 4 units per acre is required in urban areas).
 - Capacity is a result of the citizens' vision for what level of development they want in their city.
- Evaluation of residential growth capacity is necessary to determine whether the King County housing growth target (new housing units) can be accommodated within city limits and/or the UGA.
 - Sufficient capacity is available if residential growth capacity is equal to or greater than the King County target.
 - Sufficient capacity is not available, the shortfall must be addressed by revising allowable density or UGA annexation to provide additional area for residential growth capacity.

Based on calculations completed by the City of Duvall in 2005 and 2006, Duvall's total residential growth capacity was estimated to be 2,650 new housing units within city limits and UGA/UGAR areas. The total residential growth capacity was used as the basis by King County for establishing a target of 1,140 new housing units by 2031 (King County, 2007).

Table H-6. Duvall Residential Housing Unit Target and Capacity

King County Growth Target (2006-2031)	Housing Units Built in Duvall (2006-2014)	Remaining King County Growth Target (2015-2031)	Capacity for New Housing Units (2015-2031)	Growth Target Surplus	Total Residential Capacity
1,140 ¹	352	788	1,293 ²	505	3,880 ³

¹King County developed this target in 2006 based on the assumption that Duvall had the capacity for 2,650 net new residential units within city limits and adjacent Urban Growth Areas (King County, 2007).

²This value identifies the anticipated number of new housing units that could be accommodated within city limits consistent with the City's Future Land Use Map (see Land Use Element) and Zoning Map along with the North UGA, two parcels in the UGA-Reserve South, and the Southwest UGA should they be annexed (City of Duvall, 2016).

³This value identifies the number of new housing units anticipated within areas described in Footnote 2 plus 2,587 existing housing units as of 2015 (City of Duvall, 2016).

Jurisdiction	1: Estimates/Inputs								2: Share of Regional Geography Total											
									Total											
									Transport	Freeway	State	Transit	% Housing	% Jobs	% HU	% Jobs	% HU	% Jobs	% HU	% Job
	Housing								Connections	Interchange	Highways	Routes	Units 2020	2019	Target	Target	2006-19	2012-18	Capacity	Capacity
Algona	1,060	2,431	190	210	93	43	337	948	3	0	1	2	2%	6%	1%	2%	1%	1%	1%	1%
Beaux Arts	119	21	3	3	0	9	2	0	1	0	0	1	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Black Diamond	2,087	428	1,900	1,050	185	92	4,708	6,510	4	0	1	3	3%	1%	12%	10%	1%	1%	18%	9%
Carnation (+ UGA)	920	802	330	370	164	115	488	2,953	3	0	1	2	1%	2%	2%	3%	1%	2%	2%	4%
Clyde Hill	1,099	839	10	0	17	197	0	0	10	1	1	8	2%	2%	0%	0%	0%	3%	0%	0%
Covington	7,185	5,231	1,470	1,320	1,632	483	5,238	11,846	7	1	2	4	10%	13%	10%	12%	13%	7%	20%	16%
Duvall (+ UGA)	2,778	1,315	1,140	840	636	301	1,536	9,402	4	0	1	3	4%	3%	7%	8%	5%	4%	6%	13%
Enumclaw (+ UGA)	5,682	5,224	1,425	735	486	262	1,668	2,737	5	0	3	2	8%	13%	9%	7%	4%	4%	6%	4%
Hunts Point	184	73	1	0	3	29	5	0	10	1	1	8	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Maple Valley	9,432	4,408	1,800	2,000	2,515	946	1,298	4,115	7	0	2	5	14%	11%	12%	18%	19%	13%	5%	6%
Medina	1,253	600	19	0	71	110	54	0	10	1	1	8	2%	1%	0%	0%	1%	2%	0%	0%
Milton	735	88	50	160	271	98	184	5,294	3	0	2	1	1%	0%	0%	1%	2%	1%	1%	7%
Normandy Park	2,881	902	120	65	82	149	4,248	30	3	0	1	2	4%	2%	1%	1%	1%	2%	16%	0%
North Bend (+ UGA)	3,955	3,398	665	1,050	416	508	2,311	8,993	6	1	2	3	6%	8%	4%	10%	3%	7%	9%	12%
Pacific	2,466	830	285	370	314	49	495	631	6	1	1	4	4%	2%	2%	3%	2%	1%	2%	1%
Sammamish	22,390	8,320	4,180	1,800	3,963	1,172	3,288	1,474	8	0	1	7	32%	20%	27%	16%	30%	16%	13%	2%
Skykomish	173	61	10	0	7	6	54	0	1	0	1	0	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Snoqualmie (+ UGA)	5,024	6,264	1,615	1,050	2,168	2,754	375	18,692	5	0	1	4	7%	15%	11%	10%	17%	38%	1%	25%
Yarrow Point	422	90	14	0	15	0	17	0	8	0	1	7	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
RG Total	69,845	41,325	15,227	11,023	13,039	7,322	26,305	73,626					100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

RG Housing	
Allocation	13,985
RG Jobs Allocation	12,936

HU Target Includes UGA @ 1 per 5 acres

HU Capacity does not include UGA

Jobs Capacity
1 job per 750 sf for industrial
1 job per 350 sf for other areas

3. Preliminary Targets based on proportion of:										4: Target Baselines*		Comparison Values			
Housing					Jobs				Housing Target	Jobs Target	HU Capacity	Existing HU Target	Job Capacity	Existing Job Target	
Housing Units 2020	HU Target	HU 2006-18	HU Capacity	2019 Jobs	Jobs 2019	Jobs Target	2012-18	Job Capacity							
212	175	100	179	823	761	246	77	167	151	313	337	190	948	210	
24	3	0	1	7	7	4	16	0	1	7	2	3	0	3	
418	1,745	198	2,503	145	134	1,232	162	1,144	1,482	668	4,708	1,900	6,510	1,050	
184	303	176	259	271	251	434	204	519	246	352	488	330	2,953	370	
220	9	19	0	284	263	0	347	0	9	152	0	10	0	0	
1,439	1,350	1,751	2,785	1,770	1,637	1,549	853	2,081	1,962	1,530	5,238	1,470	11,846	1,320	
556	1,047	682	817	445	412	986	532	1,652	849	895	1,536	1,140	9,402	840	
1,138	1,309	522	887	1,768	1,635	863	463	481	906	860	1,668	1,425	2,737	735	
37	1	3	3	25	23	0	51	0	2	18	5	1	0	0	
1,889	1,653	2,698	690	1,492	1,380	2,347	1,671	723	1,680	1,530	1,298	1,800	4,115	2,000	
251	17	77	29	203	188	0	194	0	41	96	54	19	0	0	
147	46	291	98	30	28	188	172	930	145	330	184	50	5,294	160	
577	110	88	2,258	305	282	76	262	5	819	157	4,248	120	30	65	
792	611	446	1,229	1,150	1,064	1,232	897	1,580	762	1,193	2,311	665	8,993	1,050	
494	262	337	263	281	260	434	86	111	287	223	495	285	631	370	
4,483	3,839	4,251	1,748	2,816	2,604	2,112	2,071	259	3,279	1,762	3,288	4,180	1,474	1,800	
35	9	7	29	21	19	0	11	0	15	8	54	10	0	0	
1,006	1,483	2,325	199	2,120	1,961	1,232	4,866	3,284	1,336	2,836	375	1,615	18,692	1,050	
84	13	16	9	30	28	0	0	0	13	7	17	14	0	0	
13,985	13,985	13,985	13,985	13,985	12,936	12,936	12,936	12,936							

556 - verified

Planning Period is 2019-2044

*Housing baseilne includes HU Target, Recent Growth, and Initial Capacity. Job baseline includes all factors.
AVG
CDE 9

Residential Development Status

Preliminary Subdivisions - Under Permit Review (not ready for home construction)

Development Name	Current Status	Current Zoning	Application/DA Date (Vesting)	Preliminary Plat Approval	Preliminary Plat Expiration	Size (Acres)	Total Units
Ridge at Big Rock-Phase 3&4 (aka Walden)	Clear & Grade	R-12 & MUI	12/14/2007	4/26/2019	4/26/2024	38.54	206
Rio Vista	Clear & Grade	R-8	6/16/2015	8/12/2016	8/12/2021	12.70	67
Sunset Court	Engineering Approval	R-12	3/22/2016	11/26/2018	11/26/2023	1.02	11
Pulte 65 Degrees	Engineering Review	R-20	9/13/2018	7/7/2020	7/7/2025	4.50	67
Thayer	Engineering Review	R-4.5	10/1/2018	6/29/2020	6/29/2025	3.69	16
Batten Creek	Engineering Review	R-4	10/10/2018	8/4/2020	8/4/2025	9.40	8
Thomas-Nolf	Engineering Review	R-8	11/16/2018	10/16/2020	10/16/2025	4.46	27
145th Street Village	P-Plat Review	R-12 & CO	10/8/2020	Under Review	Under Review	4.89	48
Meadowlark	P-Plat Review	R-8	1/6/2020	Under Review	Under Review	4.35	28
Total						83.55	478

Final Subdivisions - Legal Lots Established (ready for home construction)

Development	Zoning	Application/DA Date (Vesting)	Preliminary Plat Approval	Final Plat Approval	Vesting to Final Plat (Avg = 11.7 yrs)	Size (Acres)	Total Lots	Building Permits Issued
Willow Ridge - Lot 21	R-12*	1997	7/23/1998	10/24/2013	16	0.55	14	14
Willow Ridge - Lot 22	R-12*	1997	7/23/1998	11/14/2013	16	0.62	12	0
Ridge at Big Rock-Phase 1	MU-12	12/22/2008	6/16/2010	10/15/2019	10.8	23.30	45	42
Ridge at Big Rock-Phase 2	MU-12	12/22/2008	6/16/2010	3/3/2020	11.2		99	69
Duvall Village	MU-12	4/18/2014	7/6/2015	12/10/2019	4.5	34.30	99	99
Total						58.77	269	224

Updated January 2021